



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/634,213	08/09/2000	Glen D. Stone	50N3540/1449	5599
24272	7590	09/30/2005	EXAMINER	
Gregory J. Koerner Redwood Patent Law 1291 East Hillsdale Boulevard Suite 205 Foster City, CA 94404			ALI, SYED J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	
DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/634,213

Applicant(s)

STONE ET AL.

Examiner

Syed J. Ali

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 36-39 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-35, 40 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed July 20, 2005. Claims 1-41 are presented for examination.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. **Claims 14, 16, 19-35, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McColl et al. (USPN 6,763,519) (hereinafter McColl).**

4. As per claim 14, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for effectively managing resources in an electronic device, comprising:

a resource characterization coupled to said electronic device, said resource characterization corresponding to a requested process (col. 18 lines 20-25; col. 19 lines 44-46); and

an interface manager configured to provide a user interface that includes resource information from said resource characterization (Abstract, col. 19 lines 30-33), a system user viewing said user interface to interactively perform an analysis procedure of available system resources required to support said requested process (Abstract, col. 18 lines 53-57), said user interface including projected resource usages for said requested process and allocated resources for existing processes (col. 19 lines 50-56); and

a processor device for controlling said interface manager (col. 19 lines 36-43).

5. It is noted that McColl does not explicitly state that the projected resource usage is displayed in the user interface in combination with the allocated resources for existing processes. However, McColl discloses an extensive control mechanism to monitor the system resources to ensure that a task or job obtains the requisite resources (col. 18 lines 58-63). The system has an ongoing view of all tasks running in the system, including reserved and unreserved resources (col. 19 lines 44-46) in addition to the previous, current, and projected usage for a job (col. 19 lines 6-12; col. 19 lines 50-56). In addition, a user interface is described that has the function of allowing a user or system administrator to submit jobs and closely monitor the resource usage of the system (col. 19 lines 30-43). The specific details of the user interface are left somewhat vague, but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that user interfaces are highly customizable to suit a wide variety of needs. The functionality described at length by McColl of allowing a user tight control over job submission and system resources are easily incorporated into the user interface. In fact, McColl describes all the features of the claimed invention, but merely fails to explicitly describe the organization of the user interface.

6. As per claim 16, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 14 wherein said electronic device is one of a consumer-electronics device, an audio-visual device, a set-top box, and a personal computer device (Abstract, col. 9 lines 5-34).

Art Unit: 2195

7. As per claim 19, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 14 wherein a system user generates a request to instantiate said requested process on said electronic device (col. 18 lines 21-25; col. 19 line 50 - col. 20 line 7).

8. As per claim 20, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 19 wherein an allocation manager evaluates said resource characterization in response to said request from said software module (col. 18 lines 21-25; col. 19 line 30 - col. 20 line 7).

9. As per claim 21, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 20 wherein said resource characterization includes one or more resource listings and one or more corresponding resource usage values that are required for a deterministic performance of said requested process (col. 18 lines 21-25; col. 19 lines 50-56).

10. As per claim 22, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 20 wherein said resource characterization includes resource information regarding total available resources from said electronic device (col. 19 lines 50-56).

11. As per claim 23, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 20 wherein said allocation manager compares resource usage values from said resource characterization and current available resource values from said electronic device to determine whether to authorize said requested process (col. 18 lines 21-25; col. 19 lines 50-56).

Art Unit: 2195

12. As per claim 24, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 23 wherein said allocation manager authorizes said requested process whenever said resource usage values from said resource characterization are less than or equal to said current available resource values from said electronic device (col. 18 lines 21-25; col. 19 lines 50-56).

13. As per claim 25, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 23 wherein said allocation manager denies said requested process whenever said resource usage values from said resource characterization are greater than said current available resource values from said electronic device (col. 19 line 30 - col. 20 line 7).

14. As per claim 26, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 24 wherein a picokernel in said electronic device instantiates and executes said requested process after said allocation manager authorizes said requested process (Abstract, col. 9 lines 35-61; col. 19 lines 30-43).

15. As per claim 27, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 14 wherein said interface manager displays current existing resource usages in a normal operational mode on said user interface (col. 19 lines 30-56).

16. As per claim 28, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 27 wherein said user interface includes a current resource indicator that provides information regarding current existing resource usages on said electronic device (col. 19 lines 50-56).

17. As per claim 29, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 14 wherein one of a system user and a network entity generates a request to instantiate a new task on said electronic device (col. 18 lines 53-57; col. 19 lines 30-43).

18. As per claim 30, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 29 wherein said interface manager displays current existing resource usages and said projected resource usages on said user interface in a request mode, said projected resource usages including additional resources required for said new task (col. 19 lines 50-56).

19. As per claim 31, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 30 wherein said user interface includes a projected resource indicator that provides information regarding said projected resource usages that include additional resources required for said new task (col. 18 lines 21-25; col. 19 lines 50-56).

20. As per claim 32, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 30 wherein said user interface includes a request result field that provides information regarding whether sufficient additional resources are available to instantiate said new task (col. 18 lines 21-25; col. 19 lines 50-56).

Art Unit: 2195

21. As per claim 33, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 30 wherein an allocation manager allocates resources to instantiate said new task when sufficient additional resources are available (col. 18 lines 21-25; col. 19 lines 50-56).

22. As per claim 34, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 30 wherein said system user cancels said request whenever said user interface indicates that sufficient additional resources are not available (col. 19 lines 30-43).

23. As per claim 35, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 30 wherein said system user cancels an existing task whenever said user interface indicates that sufficient additional resources are not available (col. 19 lines 30-43).

24. As per claim 40, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer-readable medium comprising program instructions for managing resources in an electronic device by performing the steps of:

referencing a resource characterization with an interface manager, said resource characterization corresponding to a requested process (col. 18 lines 20-25; col. 19 lines 44-46);

generating a user interface with said interface manager based upon said resource characterization (col. 19 lines 30-56), said user interface including projected resource usages for said requested process and allocated resources for previously existing processes (col. 19 lines 50-56); and

controlling said interface manager with a processor that is coupled to said electronic device (col. 19 lines 30-43).

25. As per claim 41, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for managing resources in an electronic device, comprising:

means for maintaining a resource characterization, said resource characterization corresponding to a requested process (col. 18 lines 20-25; col. 19 lines 44-46);

means for generating a user interface based upon said resource characterization (col. 19 lines 30-56); and

means for controlling said means for generating a user interface, said means for controlling including a processor device (col. 19 lines 30-43).

26. **Claims 1-13, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McColl in view of Gulick (USPN 6,502,123).**

27. As per claim 1, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of interfacing to a user of a device, comprising:

displaying a representation of a currently used portion of a processing capacity of a device (Abstract, col. 9 lines 5-34; col. 19 lines 30-56), said user viewing said representation to interactively perform an analysis procedure of available system resources required to support an additional process (Abstract, col. 19 lines 30-56), said representation also including projected resource usages for said additional processes (col. 19 lines 30-56).

Art Unit: 2195

28. McColl does not explicitly teach monitoring resources relating to processing of isochronous tasks in an isochronous processing device. Gulick teaches this limitation (col. 8 lines 46-67).

29. As noted and discussed in paragraph 8 above, McColl does not explicitly state that the projected resource usage is displayed in the user interface concurrently with the allocated resources for existing processes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine McColl and Gulick since the scheduling method and resource allocation method provided by McColl are applicable to essentially any type of processing system, including many different types of operating systems (col. 9 lines 5-34). Gulick addresses that many conventional systems do not have support for multimedia devices that operate in real-time, such as isochronous devices (col. 1 lines 25-43). The scheduling mechanism used by Gulick is decidedly similar to that of McColl, in that a determination is made as to whether there are enough available system resources to support the requesting task. Thus, to modify McColl to include support for isochronous processes adds features to McColl that would support a wider variety of systems, provided that they meet the criteria set forth in the system design that McColl requires (col. 9 lines 5-34).

30. As per claim 2, Gulick teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, wherein the device is selected from an isochronous bus, an IEEE-1394 bus, a programmable computer performing isochronous processing, an isochronous data encoder, an isochronous data decoder, an isochronous data transcoder, a source of isochronous data, a sink of isochronous data, an audio/video hard disk drive [AVHDD], an isochronous data storage and retrieval device,

Art Unit: 2195

and a device capable of concurrently performing at least one isochronous task (Abstract; col. 1 lines 12-24; col. 4 lines 33-67).

31. As per claim 3, Gulick teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving a user request to initiate a task, wherein the displaying is initiated when honoring the user request would exceed the isochronous processing capacity (col. 17 lines 17-29).

32. As per claim 4, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 3, further comprising accepting a user selection of at least one of a plurality of isochronous tasks currently active on the device (col. 19 lines 30-43; col. 19 line 57 - col. 20 line 7); and
sacrificing the selected task (col. 19 lines 30-43; col. 19 line 57 - col. 20 line 7).

33. As per claim 5, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 4, wherein the sacrificing is selected from terminating the selected task, suspending the selected task and performing the selected task in a degraded mode of operation (col. 19 lines 30-43; col. 19 line 57 - col. 20 line 7).

34. As per claim 6, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, wherein the representation graphically shows a relationship between the currently used portion and the isochronous processing capacity (col. 19 lines 30-56).

35. As per claim 7, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, wherein the representation shows how the currently used portion is allocated among a plurality of isochronous tasks currently active on the device (col. 19 lines 30-56).

36. As per claim 8, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of interfacing to a user of an isochronous device, comprising:

receiving a user request to initiate a task (col. 19 lines 30-56; col. 21 lines 4-11);

displaying a representation of a processing capacity of a device (Abstract, col. 9 lines 5-34; col. 19 lines 30-56), said user viewing said representation to interactively perform an analysis procedure of available system resources required to support said task (Abstract, col. 19 lines 30-56), said representation including currently-allocated resources for previously-existing tasks and projected resource usages for said task (col. 19 lines 30-56); and

accepting a user selection of a currently active task that is to be sacrificed in favor of the requested task (col. 19 lines 30-43; col. 19 line 57 - col. 20 line 7).

37. Gulick teaches the invention as claimed, including monitoring resources relating to processing of isochronous tasks in an isochronous processing device (col. 8 lines 46-67); and

the displaying being initiated when honoring the user request would exceed the processing capacity (col. 17 lines 17-29).

38. As per claim 9, Gulick teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 8, wherein the device is selected from an isochronous bus, an IEEE-1394 bus, a programmable computer performing isochronous processing, an isochronous data encoder, an isochronous data

Art Unit: 2195

decoder, an isochronous data transcoder, a source of isochronous data, a sink of isochronous data, an audio/video hard disk drive [AVHDD], a isochronous data storage and retrieval device, and a device capable of concurrently performing more than one isochronous task (Abstract; col. 1 lines 12-24; col. 4 lines 33-67).

39. As per claim 10, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 8 wherein the representation comprises a representation of a projected state of the isochronous processing capacity if the requested task were initiated (col. 19 lines 30-56).

40. As per claim 11, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 8 wherein the sacrificing is selected from terminating the selected task, suspending the selected task and converting the selected task to an asynchronous mode of operation (col. 19 lines 30-43; col. 19 line 57 - col. 20 line 7).

41. As per claim 12, McColl teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of indicating to a user a current usage of a device, comprising:

displaying a representation for a particular one of a plurality of tasks being handled by the device (Abstract, col. 9 lines 5-34; col. 19 lines 30-56), said user viewing said representation to interactively perform an analysis procedure of available system resources required to support an additional process (Abstract, col. 19 lines 30-56), the representation being of a portion of the capacity used by the particular task (col. 19 lines 30-56); and

displaying, when the representation is selected, a breakdown of a plurality of types of resources used by the particular task (col. 19 lines 30-56).

42. Gulick teaches the invention as claimed, including monitoring resources relating to processing of isochronous tasks in an isochronous processing device (col. 8 lines 46-67).

43. As per claim 13, Gulick teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 12, wherein the device is selected from an isochronous bus, an IEEE-1394 bus, a programmable computer performing isochronous processing, an isochronous data encoder, an isochronous data decoder, an isochronous data transcoder, a source of isochronous data, a sink of isochronous data, an audio/video hard disk drive [AVHDD], a isochronous data storage and retrieval device, and a device capable of concurrently performing at least one isochronous task (Abstract; col. 1 lines 12-24; col. 4 lines 33-67).

44. As per claim 15, Gulick teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 14, wherein said electronic device is coupled to an electronic network that is implemented according to an IEEE Std 1394 serial bus standard (Abstract; col. 1 lines 12-24; col. 4 lines 33-67).

45. As per claim 17, Gulick teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 14 wherein said requested process includes one or more time-sensitive isochronous processes for manipulating time-critical isochronous data, and wherein said means for controlling includes at least one of a processor device and dedicated logic (col. 8 lines 46-67).

Response to Arguments

46. **Applicant's arguments filed July 20, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.**

47. Applicant argues on pages 13-14 of the present response that McColl fails to teach a user interface that displays projected resource usages in combination with allocated resources. McColl clearly discusses storing data pertaining to resource usages for the system (col. 19 lines 50-56, "The system provides detailed dynamic monitoring and reporting facilities, which describe the previous, current and projected resource usage for each job.") Additionally, McColl discusses interactive software tools, particularly a user interface, allowing the system manager to have tight control over the resources and jobs in the system (col. 19 lines 30-49). Without getting bogged down in the minutiae of user interfaces, McColl allows the designer of the system to take the concepts disclosed and apply it as they see fit. User interfaces are hardly a complex realm of technology; many tools, e.g. Visual Basic, are available for even the most novice developers to make detailed, high interactivity user interfaces with minimal programming experiences. The difficulty lies in representing data and extracting it in a usable form. McColl provides these teachings, making the user interface itself a simple endeavor of any developer with even minimal experience.

48. In response to Applicant's argument on page 14 of the present response that claim 41 is not anticipated or made obvious by McColl, Applicant points to the specification at page 18 line

Art Unit: 2195

11 through page 24 line 4 as describing the claimed “means for generating a user interface.” However, Applicant has not pointed out what in the specification distinguishes the claimed “means” from McColl. Applicant merely recites a legal standard followed by a citation to the specification. Without identifying what the distinguishing characteristics of Applicant’s claimed elements are, this argument is practically without meaning. Furthermore, the passages referred to by Applicant state that “any means or technique for implementing a user interface to thereby provide a representation of information” is sufficient for the claimed “means for generating a user interface.” Given this broad recitation of “means” coupled with the fact that McColl provides a user interface, McColl thereby inherently teaches a means within the computer system that generates the user interface and displays it on the monitor.

49. Applicant argues on page 15 of the present response that McColl fails to teach a “normal operational mode” or a “request mode”, but fails to identify what distinguishes the claims from McColl. Applicant’s arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

50. Applicant argues on page 18, *“the simple query disclosed by Gulick is far less than the substantial ‘analysis procedure’ performed by a system of Applicants’ claimed invention.”* Applicant continues to simply reiterate previous arguments without acknowledging previous responses to these arguments. To reiterate Examiner’s previous reply to this argument, the claim merely recites an “analysis procedure”. The alleged substantiality of this procedure is

Art Unit: 2195

conspicuously absent from the claim. "Analysis procedure" is read broadly, and a "simple query" is sufficient to demonstrate a user-initiated analysis of available system resources to determine whether an additional task can be adequately supported. Nonetheless, Gulick has not even been relied upon by Examiner as teaching the "analysis procedure." This is shown by McColl, with citations provided above in paragraphs 4, 27, 36, and 41.

51. In response to Applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Furthermore, Applicant has merely presented a legal standard discussing the requirements for a proper motivation without any discussion of why Examiner's motivation is deficient.

Applicant previously presented this argument regarding the motivation to combine and Examiner responded in detail. This response is hereby reproduced: Examiner respectfully submits that there is implicit motivation to combine McColl and Gulick. Specifically, Gulick addresses the importance of only initiating an isochronous task if sufficient resources are available to service the task (Abstract). Thus, a need exists to provide a robust way of managing resources, preferably by giving at least some control to the user or system administrator. For this, McColl is cited as providing a resource monitoring system, while allowing the user or

Art Unit: 2195

system administrator a great deal of control over the level of resources available and a way of verifying that an adequate quality of service will be provided.

Examiner has not entered into a discussion of Applicant's claimed invention, instead providing discussion of the references themselves and the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the references. If Applicant continues to be dissatisfied with the Examiner's motivation, it is hereby requested that Applicant respond to this discussion by Examiner rather than simply reasserting previous arguments without referencing Examiner's responses.

Allowable Subject Matter

52. **Claims 36-39 are allowed.**

53. **Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.**

Conclusion

54. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2195

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed J. Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-3769. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5:30, 2nd Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai T. An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Syed Ali
September 27, 2005



MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL STAFF